UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,215	12/08/2003	Liselotte Bjerre Knudsen	5367.230-US	3299

23650 7590 09/29/2004

NOVO NORDISK PHARMACEUTICALS, INC
100 COLLEGE ROAD WEST
PRINCETON, NJ 08540

EXAMINER	
MCKELVEY, TERRY ALAN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1636	

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/730,215	KNUDSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Terry A. McKelvey	1636	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *1* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-3 and 6-9, drawn to GLP-2 derivative and pharmaceutical composition, classified in class 530, subclass 308 and class 514, subclass 8.

II. Claims 4-5 and 10-11 (only as it reads on treating small bowel syndrome), drawn to method of treating small bowel syndrome, classified in class 514, subclass 8.

III. Claim 4-5 and 10-11 (only as it reads on treating Crohn's disease), drawn to method for treating Crohn's disease, classified in class 514, subclass 8.

IV. Claim 4-5 and 10-11 (only as it reads on treating ileitis), drawn to method for treating ileitis, classified in class 514, subclass 8.

V. Claim 4-5 and 10-11 (only as it reads on treating intestinal inflammation), drawn to method for treating intestinal inflammation, classified in class 514, subclass 8.

VI. Claim 4-5 and 10-11 (only as it reads on treating intestinal gastric and duodenal ulceration), drawn to method for treating gastric and duodenal ulceration, classified in class 514, subclass 8.

VII. Claim 4-5 and 10-11 (only as it reads on treating inflammatory bowel disease), drawn to method for treating inflammatory bowel disease, classified in class 514, subclass 8.

VIII. Claim 4-5 and 10-11 (only as it reads on treating intestinal cancer damage therapy), drawn to method for treating intestinal cancer damage therapy, classified in class 514, subclass 8.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions of Group I and Groups II-VIII are related as product and processes of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product can be used in a materially different process of using, as evidenced by the inventions of Groups II-VIII which comprise

treating very different conditions with the same pharmaceutical composition comprising GLP-2.

Inventions of Groups II-VIII are biologically and functionally different and distinct from each other and thus one does not render the other obvious. The methods of Groups II-VIII comprise steps which are not required for or present in the methods of the other groups: administration of GLP-2 to a small bowel syndrome patient (Group II), administration of GLP-2 to a Crohn's disease patient (Group III), administration of GLP-2 to an ileitis patient (Group IV), administration of GLP-2 to an intestinal inflammation patient (Group V), administration of GLP-2 to a gastric and duodenal ulceration patient (Group VI), administration of GLP-2 to an inflammatory bowel disease patient (Group VII), and administration of GLP-2 to an intestinal cancer damage patient (Group VIII). The end result of the methods are different: treatment of the respective different diseases in the patients described above (Groups II-VIII). Thus, the operation, function and effects of these different methods are different and distinct from each other. Therefore, the inventions of these different, distinct groups are capable of supporting separate patents.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Groups I-VIII are not required

for the other members of the groups because a non-patent literature search for the GLP-2 peptide and a pharmaceutical composition comprising the peptide of Group I would not necessarily identify the use of the peptide in any of the claimed treatments and vice versa, a search of the treatments for the specified diseases of Groups II-VIII would not necessarily identify the relevant prior art in the non-patent literature concerning the treatment of the other unrelated diseases, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. In other words, because the non-patent literature search would require a separate, only partially overlapping search for each use of the claimed product in a different, unrelated disease and for the peptide/pharmaceutical composition, it would require an undue burden to search the non-overlapping portions of the non-patent literature of all of the 8 groups of the claimed invention, and thus it would impose a serious burden to examine all groups together.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: the specific GLP-2 derivatives encompassed by the claims (e.g., different species of claims 1 and 6). Pick one specific peptide encompassed by claims 1 and 6.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-11 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the

inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

> The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.
>
> In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an

otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Conclusion

Certain papers related to this application may be submitted to Art Unit 1636 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). The official fax telephone number for the Group is 703-872-9306. NOTE: If Applicant *does* submit a paper by fax, the original signed copy should be retained by applicant or applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

Any inquiry concerning rejections or objections in this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Terry A. McKelvey whose telephone number is (571) 272-0775. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, except for Wednesdays, from about 7:30 AM to about 6:00 PM. A phone message left at this number will be responded to as soon as possible (i.e., shortly after the examiner returns to his office).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Remy Yucel can be reached at (571) 272-0781.

Terry A. McKelvey, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1636

September 24, 2004